

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 AMANA GLOBAL COMPANY, et  
11 al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 KING COUNTY FLOOD  
15 CONTROL ZONE DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-1626JLR

MINUTE ORDER

16 The following minute order is made by the direction of the court, the Honorable  
17 James L. Robart:

18 Before the court is *pro se* Plaintiffs' motion for extension of time to respond to the  
19 court's April 6, 2023 show cause order. (Mot. (Dkt. # 43).) Plaintiffs' response to the  
20 court's show cause order was due April 21, 2023. (*See* OSC (Dkt. # 39).) Although  
21 Plaintiffs timely responded to the court's order, they request an extension of time to file  
22 an amended response because they "had prior work commitments" that "significantly

1 interfered with the filing of the response.” (Mot. at 2 (noting that “the response requires  
2 extensive research of the issue raised in the order to show cause”).)

3 “A motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible, be filed  
4 sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the  
5 deadline.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(j). “Parties should not assume that the  
6 motion will be granted and must comply with the existing deadline unless the court  
7 orders otherwise.” *Id.* “When an act . . . must be done within a specified time, the court,  
8 may, for good cause, extend the time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). Plaintiffs were given two  
9 weeks to respond to the court’s order to show cause, which requested briefing on the sole  
10 issue of whether Plaintiffs’ claims were barred by the applicable statute of limitations.  
11 (*See generally* OSC.) Plaintiffs, however, waited to file the instant motion for an  
12 extension of time until 11:52 p.m. on April 21, 2023, the night their response to the  
13 court’s order to show cause was due. (*See generally* Mot.) In the court’s view, Plaintiffs  
14 motion for an extension of time, filed the night their response was due, is untimely.  
15 Moreover, even if Plaintiffs’ motion was timely, Plaintiffs have not shown good cause for  
16 an extension of time. To the contrary, the statements in the motion show that Plaintiffs  
17 simply prioritized other matters over this litigation. (*See* Mot. at 2.)

18 Accordingly, the court DENIES Plaintiffs’ motion for extension of time (Dkt.  
19 # 43).

20 //

21 //

22 //

1 Filed and entered this 24th day of April, 2023.

2 RAVI SUBRAMANIAN  
3 Clerk of Court

4 s/ Ashleigh Drecktrah  
5 Deputy Clerk  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22